

## REMARKS

In the application claims 1-57 and 86-107 remain pending. Claims 58-85 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 86-107 have been added by amendment and find their support in the specification, figures, and claims as originally filed. Now new matter has been added.

All of pending claims presently stand rejected. The reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is, however, respectfully requested.

In the latest Office Action, the pending claims were generally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being rendered obvious by Blight (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,542) in view of Helot (U.S. Patent No. 6,309,230). In rejecting the claims, the Office Action acknowledged that Blight does not disclose the feature of a wall switch device or power switch device fastened to a wall switch module or power module, respectively. It was, however, asserted that Helot discloses a docking station that, among other things, includes a power cord that is connected to a power switch, e.g., a wall socket. Thus, the Office Action concluded that it would have been obvious to apply the technique of Helot in the system of Blight to establish a connection between a palm-type device and a notebook computer by means of a docking station.

In response to this rejection of the claims, it is respectfully submitted that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires that a combination of references disclose each and every element set forth in the claims, considering the claims “as a whole.” This requirement that the claimed invention be considered “as a whole” is meant to prevent evaluation of an invention part by part, i.e., breaking an invention into its component parts and then merely finding a reference containing one part, another reference

containing another part, etc., and to prevent the impermissible use of the specification of the applicant as a template to combine these parts for the purpose of deprecating the claimed invention. Thus, to assure that such “hindsight reasoning” is not used when assessing the patentability of a claimed invention, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires a demonstration that an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected the various parts from the references and combined them in the claimed manner.

Considering now the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that neither Blight nor Helot disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed wall switch device or power switch device. In this regard, it has been acknowledged in the Office Action that Blight fails to disclose this claimed element. With respect to Helot, it is respectfully submitted that Helot similarly fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed wall switch device or power switch device as claimed which sets forth that the wall switch device and power switch device is sized and arranged to be fastened directly to a wall switch junction box or power junction box, respectively. While Helot does disclose that his docking station includes a power cord that may be plugged into a wall socket, nothing from within Helot can be said to suggest that the docking station is sized and arranged to be directly mounted to any type of junction box, which it clearly cannot be. Thus, since none of the cited reference, whether considered alone or in combination, can be said to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element set forth in the claims, considering the claims as a whole, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The subject application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Such action on the part of the Examiner is respectfully requested. Should it be determined, however, that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the attorney undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit overpayment to deposit account number 50-2428 in the name of Greenberg Traurig.

Respectfully Submitted

By:

Gary R. Jarosik

Reg. No. 35,906

Greenberg Traurig LLP

77 W. Wacker Drive, Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60601

(312) 456-8449

Date: January 4, 2005